

Frame Relay and Data UNEs

**CC Docket No. 96-98
August 9, 1999**

APPENDIX

**e.spire Communications, Inc.
Intermedia Communications Inc.**

Frame Relay and Data UNEs

CC Docket No. 96-98

July 21, 1999

**e.spire Communications, Inc.
Intermedia Communications Inc.**

APPENDIX

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Document</i>
1	Arizona Corporation Commission Order re e.spire/U S West Frame Relay Arbitration
2	Colorado Public Utilities Commission Orders re e.spire/U S West Frame Relay Arbitration
3	New Mexico Corporation Commission Order re e.spire/U S West Frame Relay Arbitration
4	Frame Relay Service Excerpts from Ameritech Operating Companies Tariff FCC No. 2
5	Frame Relay Service Excerpts from The Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies Tariff FCC No. 1
6	Frame Relay Service Excerpts from BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. Tariff FCC No. 1
7	Frame Relay Service Excerpts from GTE System Telephone Companies Tariff FCC No. 1
8	Frame Relay Service Excerpts from Southwestern Bell Telephone Company Tariff FCC No. 73
9	Frame Relay Service Excerpts from U S West Communications Tariff FCC No. 73



Arizona Corporation Commission
BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

DOCKETED

1
2 JIM IRVIN
3 COMMISSIONER-CHAIRMAN
4 TONY WEST
5 COMMISSIONER
6 CARL J. KUNASEK
7 COMMISSIONER

FILE
ORIGINAL

FEB 19 1999

DOCKETED BY



8 IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION BY
9 E-SPIRE™ COMMUNICATIONS INC.,
10 AMERICAN COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES OF
11 PIMA COUNTY, INC. AND ACSI LOCAL
12 SWITCHED SERVICES, INC. FOR
13 ARBITRATION WITH U S WEST
14 COMMUNICATIONS, INC. OF
15 INTERCONNECTION RATES, TERMS AND
16 CONDITIONS PURSUANT TO 47 U.S.C.
17 SECTION 252(b) OF THE
18 TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.

DOCKET NO. T-01051B-98-0406
T-03596A-98-0406
T-03597A-98-0406
T-03598A-98-0406

DECISION NO. 61527

OPINION AND ORDER

12 DATE OF HEARING: November 5, 1998

13 PLACE OF HEARING: Phoenix, Arizona

14 PRESIDING ARBITRATORS: Jerry L. Rudibaugh, Lyn Farmer, and Barbara M. Behun

15 APPEARANCES: BROWN & BAIN, P.A., by Mr. Michael W. Patten and
16 KELLEY DRYE & WARREN, L.L.P., by Mr. Edward A.
17 Yorkgitis, Jr., on behalf of e-spire™ Communications, Inc. (fka
18 American Communications Services, Inc.); American
19 Communication Services of Pima County, Inc.; and ACSI Local
20 Switched Services, Inc. dba e-spire™, and

FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C., by Mr. Timothy Berg, and U S
WEST Communications, Inc., by Mr. Thomas M. Dethlefs, on
behalf of U S WEST Communications, Inc.

21 BY THE COMMISSION:

22 This is an arbitration proceeding under § 252 of the Communications Act of 1934, as
23 amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and A.A.C. R14-2-1501 through R14-2-1509, the
24 Commission's Arbitration and Mediation Rules.

25 On July 21, 1998, e-spire™ Communications, Inc. (fka American Communications Services,
26 Inc.); American Communication Services of Pima County, Inc. ("ACSPC"); and ACSI Local
27 Switched Services, Inc. dba e-spire™ ("ACSI-LSS") (collectively "e-spire™") filed with the Arizona
28 Corporation Commission ("Commission") a petition for arbitration of an amended interconnection

1 agreement with U S WEST Communications, Inc. ("U S WEST") ("Petition") pursuant to Section
2 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("1996 Act"). By Procedural Order dated July 22,
3 1998, the matter was set for an arbitration hearing on October 1, 1998. On August 7, 1998, U S
4 WEST filed its Response to the Petition.

5 On August 17, 1998, e-spire™ filed a motion for summary decision and modified arbitration
6 schedule ("Motion"). U S WEST filed a response on August 24, 1998; and e-spire™ filed a reply on
7 August 31, 1998. On September 9, 1998, oral argument was presented on the Motion, and a ruling
8 was issued. On September 17, 1998, e-spire™ submitted a proposed arbitration schedule stipulated
9 to by the parties. On September 22, 1998, the arbitration hearing was rescheduled to November 5,
10 1998. The parties submitted a joint pre-arbitration statement and pre-filed testimony. The arbitration
11 panel heard the matter on November 5, 1998, at which the parties testified and presented evidence.
12 The parties submitted post-hearing briefs on December 15, 1998.

13 DISCUSSION

14 Pursuant to the 1996 Act, based upon the date e-spire™ requested negotiation for
15 interconnection, the Commission's Decision would have been due on November 4, 1998. As the
16 parties desired additional time to complete discovery and argue pre-hearing motions, they stipulated
17 that a Decision issued at the last Open Meeting of January 1999 would be timely.

18 e-spire™'s operating subsidiary, ACSPC, was granted a Certificate of Convenience and
19 Necessity ("Certificate") to provide competitive telecommunications services in Arizona, in Decision
20 No. 60078 (February 19, 1997). The local switched services portion of the Certificate was
21 transferred from ACSPC to ACSI-LSS in Decision No. 60711 (February 27, 1998). e-spire™
22 currently operates a local fiber optic network in Tucson, Arizona. e-spire™ also provides
23 competitive local exchange services in Arizona through the resale of U S WEST's wholesale
24 products.

25 This arbitration concerns frame relay services ("FRS"). FRS is an advanced digital
26 communications service provided using high-speed, packet-switching technology. FRS may support
27 digital voice service, but it typically is used to connect end users served by the same or multiple
28

1 frame relay switches ("FR switches") for the exchange of digital data.¹ A customer accesses the
2 frame relay network ("FRN") through a user-to-network interface ("UNI") and a frame relay access
3 link ("FRAL") to the nearest FR switch. For one location to communicate with another, each
4 location is given a data link connection identifier ("DLCI"), which is placed in the header of each
5 frame and identifies the address to which each frame is to be sent. Each set of DLCIs creates a
6 permanent virtual circuit ("PVC"), which allows for one-way communication between the two
7 locations. Most FRS is between affiliate or parent and subsidiary companies, and is bi-directional.
8 For two-way communications, two PVCs consisting of two pairs of DLCIs must be provisioned. The
9 assignment of a DLCI is one-time software programming in the switches, which takes approximately
10 five to seven minutes, according to testimony. Additional PVCs may be designated as desired, to
11 enable a customer to communicate with alternative destinations, as chosen by the customer prior to
12 transmittal of the communication. There is an incremental charge for each PVC designation.

13 The FRN is commonly referred to as a "cloud". Communications do not transfer through any
14 pre-designated pathway. The frames, or packets of information, transfer through available FR
15 switches via high-speed trunks, to the FRAL of the recipient. Typically, data transfers back and forth
16 between two endpoints designated by PVCs on both ends of the communication. As not every FRS
17 customer transmits simultaneously, capacity on the network may be used by those that are
18 transmitting, allowing for faster transmission of information. According to testimony, PVCs can
19 oversubscribe the capacity of the FRALs and trunks 2:1, as the FRN is shared, and all endpoints are
20 not used at the same time.

21 Two FRNs may be connected through a network-to-network interface ("NNI"), which is a
22 frame relay port connected via a high speed access link to a corresponding NNI port on the FR switch
23 of another FRN. NNIs, like UNIs, may have multiple PVCs flowing through the same NNI port and
24 access link.

25
26 ¹ Instead of maintaining a channel of communications for the duration of the information transfer, packet
27 switching breaks the information into packets that are transmitted separately over the most efficient route available.
28 Information is reassembled at its destination. Bulk information transfers, such as inventory and ordering, between parent
corporations and branches or subsidiaries, such as banks, restaurants and supermarkets, may be conducted through
packet-switched technology.

1 The FRNs of U S WEST and e-spire™ are essentially equivalent in function and facilities,
 2 There is no technical barrier to interconnecting the two networks. Interconnection would require a
 3 NNI port at each carrier's FR switch, with high speed transport between the NNIs. DLCIs at the
 4 switches would specify locations connected by PVCs.

5 FRS customers purchase a FRAL. By tariff, customers also are charged for use of a UNI or
 6 NNI switch port, switch overhead, and use of the trunks that make up U S WEST's network. For
 7 FRS, a customer must purchase either two user-to-network information transfer ("UNIT") elements,
 8 which prices UNI ports with PVCs, or a UNIT and a network-to network information transfer
 9 ("NNIT"), which prices NNI ports with PVCs. The UNIT and NNIT include transport on U S
 10 WEST's network. Charges are not based upon the time or distance of the FRS, other than the length
 11 of the FRAL from the customer location to the FR switch.

12 1. Is FRS interconnection subject to § 251(c)(2) of the 1996 Act?

13 e-spire™ position

14 e-spire™ has stated its intention to provide FRS through the resale of U S WEST's FRS, and
 15 to combine elements of its own facilities and unbundled network elements obtained from U S WEST.
 16 e-spire™ has requested that the Commission determine the method of interconnection of its network
 17 with U S WEST's network for the provision of FRS. e-spire™ asserted that the 1996 Act's
 18 requirement that an incumbent local exchange carrier ("ILEC") interconnect its facilities with those
 19 of a competitive local exchange carrier ("CLEC") "for the transmission and routing of telephone
 20 exchange service and exchange access", 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(2), includes the obligation to
 21 interconnect for the provision of FRS. e-spire™ stated that it would be transmitting and routing
 22 telephone exchange services and exchange access services on its FRN, and on U S WEST's FRN.
 23 e-spire™ proposed a compensation plan for interconnection.

24 e-spire™ requested that it be treated as a co-carrier, rejecting U S WEST's offer to provide
 25 FRS pursuant to its tariff. e-spire™ anticipates using the interconnection for exchange access
 26 services for itself and other carriers with non-local FR traffic that originates or terminates either on
 27 e-spire™'s FRN or on another carrier's FRN with which e-spire™ is interconnected on a local basis.
 28

1 telecommunications services. Interconnection of the FRNs of e-spire™ and U S WEST should be
 2 accomplished in accordance with § 251(c)(2) of the 1996 Act, A.A.C. R14-2-1101, *et seq.*, and
 3 A.A.C. R14-2-1301, *et seq.* Likewise, pricing of the interconnection should be according to § 251(c)
 4 and § 252(d) of the 1996 Act. e-spire™, as a co-carrier, is not limited to purchase retail FRN services
 5 from U S WEST's tariff.

6 **2. Interconnection and cost issues.**

7 e-spire™ proposed that interconnecting parties each absorb the cost of providing a port on the
 8 interconnection switch, and share the cost of establishing the interconnection trunks. e-spire™'s
 9 proposed cost sharing for interconnection for intraLATA PVCs and TELRIC-based rates for
 10 interLATA traffic is as follows:

11 1. **Interconnection Ports and Transmission Facilities**

12 The parties should share the costs of local (intraLATA) interconnection equally. For
 13 the transmission facilities, *i.e.*, interconnection trunks, to the extent they are used to
 14 exchange intraLATA traffic, the costs should be shared equally based on U S WEST's
 15 TELRIC-based rates for transport. Each party should absorb the cost of its own NNI
 16 ports, to the extent the ports are used for intraLATA traffic.

17 For interLATA traffic, *i.e.*, where e-spire™ uses the interconnection to transmit and
 18 route frame relay exchange access traffic for other carriers and/or itself, e-spire™
 19 should pay for both an NNI port at the U S WEST switch and for a transmission
 20 circuit between the parties' switches, but only up to the percentage of interLATA use
 21 of the port and transmission facilities. These payments should be TELRIC-based.

22 Both intraLATA and interLATA PVCs can be carried over the same interconnection
 23 trunks and NNI ports. Jurisdictional (intra- vs. inter-LATA) allocation of port and
 24 transmission facility costs should be determined by the percentage of total PVCs over
 25 a facility that are intraLATA, *i.e.*, where both end user locations are in the same
 26 LATA.

27 2. **DLCIs**

28 For intraLATA PVCs, each party should bear its own costs to establish DLCIs. For
 interLATA PVCs, e-spire™ should pay U S WEST for DLCIs on U S WEST's end of
 the interconnection, at TELRIC-based rates. (DLCI charges should be non-recurring
 charges only.)

3. **Reciprocal Compensation for IntraLATA Traffic**

For transport and termination of local frame relay traffic carried over intraLATA
 PVCs, bill and keep arrangements should be utilized.

4. **Compensation for the End User Segment of PVCs**

For both intraLATA and interLATA PVCs, U S WEST's end user should be charged
 for the U S WEST end user's frame relay access link ("FRAL") plus the U S WEST
 UNI port and access to U S WEST's network (*i.e.*, the User-to-User Network
 Information Transfer, or "UNIT").

1 Brief, pages 11 and 12.

2 2(a). May local and toll traffic be commingled on the same trunk?

3 e-spire™ position

4 e-spire™ claimed that commingling traffic is the most efficient and cost-effective way to
5 provide FRS. e-spire™ indicated that there is no local or toll component for accessing U S WEST's
6 FRN. e-spire™ stated that distance is not measured for FRS and there is no reasonable way to
7 measure the distance of the communication. e-spire™ proposed that traffic be considered intraLATA
8 or interLATA based upon the locations in the DLCIs. According to e-spire™, since PVCs are fixed
9 and traffic is not measured, using the percentage of PVCs over a facility that are intraLATA rather
10 than interLATA is a reasonable and cost-effective method for determining intraLATA usage.

11 e-spire™ further proposed that the local calling area for FRS be the intraLATA region.
12 e-spire™ indicated that U S WEST does not presently differentiate between the local area for the
13 voice network and its intraLATA region for FRS.

14 U S WEST position

15 U S WEST proposed that separate trunking of local and toll traffic is required. U S WEST
16 claimed that usage of the PVCs allows gaming of the system, as it assumes that traffic over the FRN
17 begins and ends at the PVCs. U S WEST claimed that PVCs could be linked together to make the
18 communication over the NNI appear to be local. U S WEST also indicated that e-spire™'s current
19 interconnection agreement requires separate local and toll trunking for its voice network
20 interconnection.

21 Commission resolution

22 Commingling is an efficient and cost-effective method of providing FRS. e-spire™'s
23 agreement to separate local and toll trunking with its voice network does not prevent it from
24 commingling traffic for the provision of FRS. e-spire™ may commingle intraLATA and interLATA
25 communication on the same interconnection trunk, to be grouped and compensated for based on the
26 ratio of intraLATA to interLATA PVCs determined by using PVC endpoints.

27 e-spire™'s proposal includes safeguards and planning sessions that should be sufficient to
28

1 prevent gaming of the system. If U S WEST has reason to suspect that gaming has occurred, it
2 should submit the issue to the Commission for further consideration.

3 2(b). What is the appropriate compensation for interconnected FRS?

4 e:spire™ position

5 e:spire™'s position is as stated above. Generally, it proposed a bill and keep arrangement for
6 intraLATA FRS, and proposed to compensate U S WEST for interLATA traffic through its switch.
7 e:spire™ proposed that for interLATA traffic, U S WEST's customer should compensate U S WEST
8 for its intra-network transport and UNIT switch port.

9 As an alternative to each party absorbing the cost of its own NNI port, e:spire™ proposed that
10 it will compensate U S WEST for the NNI port at U S WEST's switch until the seventh PVC of any
11 type is loaded onto the NNI port. e:spire™'s proposal was in response to U S WEST's concern that it
12 would be locating NNI ports where dictated by competitive local exchange carriers ("CLEC"), and it
13 would not recover its costs without sufficient customers. According to U S WEST's 1996 FRS cost
14 study, once seven PVCs are loaded on the standard NNI port, U S WEST recovers from UNIT
15 charges alone its costs for the NNIT, UNIT and interconnection transport. e:spire™ acknowledged
16 that U S WEST claimed that its cost study was out-of-date, but stated that the study was the best
17 evidence available of U S WEST costs for those unbundled network elements ("UNE").

18 U S WEST position

19 U S WEST contended that FR interconnection is available through its tariff, by ordering its
20 UNIT, FRAL, and PVC, as well as e:spire™ providing use of its own PVC, FRAL, and UNIT or
21 NNIT, or equivalents, on e:spire™'s network. For example, e:spire™'s customer would have to pay
22 1 ½ PVCs and two UNITS, rather than one PVC and one UNIT under e:spire™'s proposal. A
23 network seeking to connect to U S WEST's FRN would be required to pay 100 percent of the
24 transport medium connecting the two NNI ports, its own as well as U S WEST's NNI port, U S
25 WEST's inter-switch trunking and the PVC for U S WEST's customer, and its own PVC.

26 U S WEST claimed that e:spire™'s request would modify U S WEST's retail rate structure,
27 violating Scates, and exceeding Commission jurisdiction under the 1996 Act. U S WEST also
28

1 alleged that bill and keep and reciprocal compensation should not apply to FRNs.

2 Commission resolution

3 This arbitration, as with previous arbitrations, does not alter the retail tariff structure of U S
4 WEST, and does not violate Scates. The pricing determined herein is for UNEs, interconnection, and
5 wholesale services offered for resale. Pursuant to § 252(d) of the 1996 Act, the Commission has the
6 authority to set rates and conditions for UNEs, and to define and set rates for new UNEs. There is no
7 requirement that the rate structure for UNEs mirrors the tariffed retail pricing structure. The tariffs,
8 even for items such as the NNI, are tariffed services. The tariffed pricing was formulated prior to the
9 1996 Act, including § 252(d) pricing standards. The tariffed prices do not meet the pricing or
10 compensation standards of the 1996 Act. The tariffs were designed for users who are not
11 telecommunications carriers under the 1996 Act. U S WEST's cost study, although represented to be
12 out-of-date, better reflects the intent of the 1996 Act's pricing standards than the tariffs. Therefore,
13 where not superseded by Decision No. 60635, the cost study will be used.

14 The Commission will not apportion costs of FRS solely based upon who is the requesting
15 party. Even though a request from an e-spire™ customer may trigger the ordering of the connection
16 and expenditure of funds by both parties, it is not the cost-causer in the traditional sense. Most FRS
17 is bi-directional, and the locations must be installed in software prior to transmission. For situations
18 in which PVCs are not mutual, and transmission is to be solely from an e-spire™ location to a U S
19 WEST customer, or from a U S WEST location to an e-spire™ customer, the initiator of the
20 transmission shall be required to pay for the set-up of the DLCIs, on a non-recurring basis. For
21 typical FRS, in which the U S WEST customer also creates a PVC to transmit to the e-spire™
22 customer, U S WEST's customer and U S WEST clearly benefit by the interconnection. e-spire™'s
23 fiber optic network provides access to its FR switch throughout Tucson, and it has deployed a FR
24 switch in the Phoenix LATA. e-spire™'s network serves a large portion of geographic area served
25 by U S WEST's FRN, especially as access to U S WEST FR switches is limited by its end office
26 structure. Endpoints in the LATA, but off-network, could be reached by e-spire™ through the use of
27 loops and back haul transport facilities, just as with U S WEST. Therefore, a bill and keep method of
28

1 cost-sharing establishment of DLCIs and intra-network transport is appropriate.

2 U S WEST stated that its FRS cost study is out of date. The evidence does not support the
3 use of tariffed prices as surrogates. Accordingly, the U S WEST cost study will be used as element
4 prices, where prices have not been superseded by Decision No. 60635 (January 30, 1998).²

5 In order to reduce the risk to U S WEST when required to interconnect pursuant to its
6 obligation under the 1996 Act, and in accordance with the offer made by e-spire™, e-spire™ shall
7 pay for all of the interconnect trunk and NNI port at TELRIC-based rates until seven PVCs are
8 loaded on the NNI port. As soon as seven PVCs are on the NNI port, bill and keep will apply to all
9 intraLATA PVCs on the trunk. Transport and port charges will be based upon the UNE rates adopted
10 in Decision No. 60635. This surrogate cost may be revised upon submittal by U S WEST of a
11 revised cost study, with analysis by e-spire™ and review by the Commission.

12 U S WEST is not currently authorized to provide interLATA telecommunications services.
13 Until U S WEST obtains such authority, a different compensation plan is appropriate for interLATA
14 traffic as opposed to intraLATA communications.

15 U S WEST presently provides access to interLATA FRS to its customers. Although unclear
16 from the record, it appears that U S WEST charges its interLATA FRS end-user for the portion of the
17 access link between the end user location and the UNI port, inclusive. If so, then e-spire™ should
18 pay for the remainder of the interLATA interconnection, including its own costs, and the costs for U
19 S WEST's NNI port and interconnection transport between the carriers' switches, at TELRIC-based
20 rates. These costs may include the cost for setting up DLCIs, if U S WEST is not already
21 compensated from its end user.

22 If U S WEST does not receive compensation from its interLATA FRS end user for the FRAL
23 and UNIT, then e-spire™ should compensate U S WEST for those elements, either by purchasing
24 FRS at wholesale discounted rates, or by purchasing UNEs.

25 Transport and port charges shall be based upon rates established in Decision No. 60635, with
26 the remainder of the charges from U S WEST's FRS cost study. A surrogate charge for
27

28 ² Within four months of the effective date of this Order, U S WEST shall submit a new cost study for
analysis by e-spire™ and review of the Commission.

1 establishment of DLCIs of \$10, as presented at the hearing, will be used.

2 3. What is U S WEST's resale obligation for FRS?

3 e-spire™ position

4 For resale, e-spire™ requested that it be able to purchase the FRAL and UNIT at the Section
5 251(c)(4) discount and any other applicable charge assessed end users to transport frame relay traffic
6 between the carriers. e-spire™ claimed rights to the discount even though it alleged that it was not
7 responsible for U S WEST's NNIT charge. e-spire™ alleged that the service being purchased is the
8 routing of information from U S WEST's customer's location to the point of hand off with an
9 interconnection carrier. e-spire™'s proposed compensation plan would eliminate its responsibility to
10 pay for U S WEST's NNIT. § 251(c)(4) requires an ILEC "to offer for resale at wholesale rates any
11 telecommunications service that the carrier provides at retail to subscribers who are not
12 telecommunications carriers." e-spire™ submitted that U S WEST's tariff contains no restrictions on
13 a customer purchasing single components of FRS, such as a FRAL. e-spire™ claimed that in effect,
14 the FRAL, UNIT and NNIT are retail telecommunications services, eligible for the resale discount.
15 e-spire™ claimed that U S WEST has presented a new issue regarding the items that comprise a
16 finished FRS and are eligible for a wholesale discount.

17 U S WEST position

18 U S WEST claimed that e-spire™ is not entitled to its interconnection proposal and a resale
19 discount. U S WEST also claimed that to receive the discount, the entire service as offered to
20 subscribers, including NNIT and PVC charges, must be resold by e-spire™.

21 U S WEST did not waive the issue by not broadening the scope of e-spire™'s Petition or its
22 response to e-spire™'s Motion. The issue was included in the parties' joint pre-arbitration statement
23 filed on October 21, 1998, and was included in evidence presented at the hearing, as well as the post
24 hearing briefs. It clearly is an unresolved issue over which the Commission has jurisdiction pursuant
25 to the 1996 Act and our Rules.

26 Commission resolution

27 For wholesale services offered for resale, e-spire™ must purchase the items that make up the
28

1 of the consolidated cost docket, the discount rate would be 17 percent. The parties were directed to
 2 try to resolve the discount issue. To date, the parties have not indicated any resolution of the issue.
 3 We therefore will determine the issue herein.

4 e-spire™, under the name "ACSI", had itself submitted to an earlier arbitration, in Docket No.
 5 U-3021-96-448. At the conclusion of the arbitration proceeding, the parties entered into an
 6 interconnection agreement, which was filed by the parties on April 21, 1997. The interconnection
 7 agreement provided as follows, at page 58:

8 VII. RESALE SERVICES

9 U S WEST hereby agrees that ACSI may at any time during the term of this
 10 Agreement elect to resell U S WEST's local exchange services under the terms
 11 and conditions of any local services resale agreement reached between U S
 12 WEST and any other telecommunications carrier. ACSI may select any such
 resale agreement at any time prior to the expiration of this Agreement.

13 The interconnection agreement contained a true-up provision at page 66, which was limited to
 14 unbundled network element ("UNE") rates. The Amendment, which incorporated the election of
 15 GST resale rates, did not contain any provision for interim rates or a true-up, although it did footnote
 the Decision in the GST arbitration.

16 It is possible that by footnoting Decision No. 60043, the parties intended to incorporate the
 17 interim provision in its resale rates. It is also possible that the parties anticipated that allowing ACSI
 18 to add a resale provision during the life of the contract should provide for discounts that would be
 19 permanent for the duration of the contract. In support of the latter conclusion, the underlying
 20 interconnection agreement expires on February 27, 1999, unless renewed by the parties.
 21 Furthermore, the Commission's jurisdiction is limited to issues specifically contested by the parties,
 22 and the parties can agree to terms different than those that the Commission recommends. There is no
 23 reason to believe that the original ACSI contract anticipated interim resale rates. The parties could
 24 have made such an intention clear in the amendment, which is ten pages in length, plus attachments.
 25 Based upon the foregoing, we determine that the resale discount is fixed at 17 percent for the duration
 26 of the interconnection agreement.
 27 ...
 28

* * * * *

Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the Commission finds, concludes, and orders that:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. U S WEST is certificated to provide local exchange and intraLATA telecommunications services to the public in Arizona.

2. e-spire™ is certificated to provide local exchange and statewide telecommunications services to the public in the State of Arizona.

3. On July 21, 1998, e-spire™ filed with the Commission a Petition pursuant to the 1996 Act.

4. By Procedural Order dated July 22, 1998, an arbitration hearing was scheduled for October 1, 1998.

5. On August 7, 1998, U S WEST filed a Response to the Petition.

6. On August 17, 1998, e-spire™ filed a motion for summary decision and modified arbitration schedule.

7. On August 24, 1998, U S WEST filed a response.

8. On August 31, 1998, e-spire™ filed a reply.

9. On September 9, 1998, argument was presented regarding the motion for summary decision.

10. At the conclusion of the argument, it was determined that FRS was subject to § 252(c) of the 1996 Act.

11. On September 17, 1998, e-spire™ submitted a proposed arbitration schedule stipulated to by the parties.

12. On September 22, 1998, the arbitration hearing was rescheduled to November 5, 1998.

13. On October 21, 1998, the parties submitted a joint pre-arbitration statement.

14. On October 26, 1998, the parties pre-filed testimony.

15. On November 5, 1998, the arbitration hearing commenced.

1 Inc. shall prepare an amendment to their interconnection agreement incorporating the terms of the
2 Commission's resolutions.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the signed amendment to the interconnection agreement
4 shall be submitted to the Commission for its review within twenty days of the date of this Decision.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that nothing in this Decision shall be construed to affect the
6 interstate tariffs of U S WEST Communications, Inc.

7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.

8 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.

9
10 
11 COMMISSIONER-CHAIRMAN  COMMISSIONER 
12 COMMISSIONER

13
14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, STUART R. BRACKNEY,
15 Acting Executive Secretary of the Arizona Corporation
16 Commission, have hereunto set my hand and caused the official
17 seal of the Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City
18 of Phoenix, this 19 day of Feb, 1999.

19 
20 STUART R. BRACKNEY
21 ACTING EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 SERVICE LIST FOR: e-spire™ COMMUNICATIONS INC., AMERICAN
2 COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES OF PIMA COUNTY, INC,
3 ACSI LOCAL SWITCHED SERVICES, INC. and U S WEST
4 COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

5 DOCKET NOS.: T-01051B-98-0406, T-03596A-98-0406, T-03597A-98-0406
6 and T-03598A-98-0406

7 Lex Smith
8 Michael Patten
9 BROWN & BAIN, P.C.
10 2901 N. Central Avenue
11 P.O. Box 400
12 Phoenix, Arizona 85001-0400
13 Attorneys for e-spire™ Communications, Inc.; American
14 Communications Services of Pima County, Inc. and
15 ACSI Local Switched Services, Inc.

16 Riley M. Murphy
17 Charles H.N. Kallenbach
18 David Kaufman
19 e-spire™ COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
20 133 National Business Parkway, Suite 200
21 Annapolis Junction, Maryland 20701

22 Brad E. Mutschelknaus
23 Edward A. Yorkgitis, Jr.
24 KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP
25 1200 19th Street NW Suite 500
26 Washington DC 20036

27 Timothy Berg
28 FENNEMORE CRAIG
29 3003 N. Central Ave., Suite 2600
30 Phoenix, Arizona 85012

31 Maureen Arnold
32 U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
33 3033 N. 3rd Street
34 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3088

35 Thomas Dethlefs
36 U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS INC
37 1801 California Street
38 Denver, Colorado 80202

39 Paul Bullis, Chief Counsel
40 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
41 1200 W. Washington Street
42 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

43 Director, Utilities Division
44 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
45 1200 W. Washington Street
46 Phoenix, Arizona 85007